

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached drawing sheets (each labeled "Replacement Sheet" within the margin header, as required) incorporate the following changes, and may include a complete set of all formal drawings for convenience.

In FIG. 4B, the textual notations "POINT AFTER CORRECTION" AND "POINT OBTAINED BY APPLYING PREDETERMINED WIDTH" were inter-switched to correct a reversal error made during original drawing preparation.

### **REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

### **DRAWING CHANGES**

Submitted herewith are attached drawing sheets (each labeled "Replacement Sheet" within the margin header, as required) incorporating changes as indicated within the "AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS" section of this paper.

Acknowledgment of receipt, and approval, of the drawing changes and Replacement Sheets, are respectfully requested.

### **PENDING CLAIMS**

Claims 1-13 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is presently interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 1-14 will be pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 USC '102**

The 35 USC '102 rejection of claims 1-4 as being anticipated by Hayashida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,067,502) is respectfully traversed. All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments

regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

In order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed features/limitations of Applicant's claims as set forth in remarks from Applicant's foreign representative:

**As to claim 1**

Applicant's invention establishes an area along the route by adding corrections to **correct a width of the area based on latitude**. Therefore, map information may always be supplied in a suitable range to the map device (See invention claim 1, wherein clause; FIG. 4A, 4B; page 15, lines 8-25; page 16, lines 1-23; page 21 lines 19-21).

On the other hand, as examiner points out (See Office action page 3, line 1-3), Hayashida et al. (USP6067502) disclose that a reduced scale is found using the maximum latitude, the minimum latitude, the maximum longitude and the minimum longitude to display the whole route in the 2nd screen (See Hayashida et al. FIG. 8, 15; col.21, lines 45-48).

Consequently, the objective of Hayashida et al. is to display the whole route with these latitude and longitude. Therefore Hayashida et al. does not disclose

Applicant's arrangement which makes longitudinal corrections according to the latitude.

The explicit claim limitations of independent claim 1 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **an area generator unit to set an area along the route between the two geographical points; ...wherein the area generator unit establishes the area by adding corrections to correct a width of the area based on latitude values of the route.** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to this claim should be withdrawn. The passage of Hayashida et al. which the Examiner previously cited is **changing a scale** of **both** longitude and latitude.

#### **As to claim 2**

Applicant's invention reduces a number of nodes consisting of the route, from the nodes included in the area, therefore simplifying the route area (See our invention claim 2, wherein clause; FIG. 3; page. 10, lines 16-24; page. 11 page 21, lines 21-25; page 22, lines 1-2).

On the other hand, the parts that examiner points out in Hayashida et al. are FIG. 2-4 and col. 8, 32-62 (See Office action page. 3, lines 9-11), but do not concern reducing a number of nodes. The illustration about hardware and data file is disclosed there. Consequently, Hayashida et al. does not disclose the composition which simplifies the extraction area.

The explicit claim limitations of claim 2 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **a processor unit to simplify the figure of the area;**  
**...wherein the processor unit reduces a number of nodes consisting the route from the nodes included in the area generated by the area generator.** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to this claim should be withdrawn.

**As to claim 3**

Applicant's invention expands a range of an area along the route in the vicinity of the enroute stopping points as the area. Therefore, Applicant's invention can get larger route area map information and a field of activities may be expanded. (See our invention claim 3, wherein clause; FIG. 9; page. 17, lines 10-25; page. 18; page. 19, lines 1-22).

On the other hand, as examiner points out (See Office action page. 3, lines 3-4, 6-8), Hayasida et al. disclose a facility data Me which stores data related to positions of objective places where the driver may wish to drop in, in addition to the destinations (See Hayashida et al. FIG. 2, 3; col. 10, lines 49-53; col. 11, lines 38-40). Also, Hayasida et al. disclose that the facilities and the distance along the guide route are retrieved considering the present position of the car (See Hayashida et al. col. 57, lines 65-67; col. 58, lines 1-2 etc.). Furthermore, Hayasida et al. disclose that when the car deviates from the guide route, the return route to return to this guide route is once searched and a road map in the car neighborhood is shown by

the reduced scale in which the return route and so on are appropriately displayed in the 2nd screen (See Hayashida et al. FIG. 37-40; col. 49, lines 61-67 etc.).

Consequently, Hayashida et al. focus on the data about facilities in which the car may drop in on along the way of a guide route, but don't disclose a route area predictor for predicting enroute stopping points along the route and don't expand a range of an area along the route in the vicinity of the enroute stopping points as the area.

The explicit claim limitations of claim 3 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayshida et al., are: **a route area predictor for predicting enroute stopping points along the route; an area generator unit to set an search area between the two geographical points; ...wherein the area generator unit expands a range for an area along the route in the vicinity of the enroute stopping points as the search area.** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to this claim should be withdrawn.

#### **As to claim 4**

The feature of Hayashida et al. is to indicate a distance and required time to the end point of a guide route (See Hayashida et al. col.34, lines 51-67; col.35, lines 1-8). Therefore, Hayashida et al. don't disclose the route area predictor which establishes the enroute stopping points based on the predicted trip time schedule along the route (See our invention page. 18, lines 13-16).

The explicit claim limitations of claim 4 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **wherein said route area predictor establishes the enroute stopping points based on the predicted trip time schedule along the route.** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to this claim should be withdrawn.

**As to claim 5,6**

The feature of Hayashida et al. is to execute the screen division of the display by an environment change such as a change of a running time and a change of remain value of fuel (See Hayashida et al col.70, lines 18-67). Therefore, Hayashida et al. don't disclose the route area predictor which establishes the enroute stopping points based on the remaining fuel value information received from the terminal, the specified rest break time period and a continuous driving time (See our invention page.18, lines 13-18; page.13-15 etc.).

The explicit claim limitations of claims 5-6 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **wherein the route area predictor establishes the enroute stopping points based on the remaining fuel value information received from the terminal (or based on the specified rest break time period or a continuous driving time).** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to these claims should be withdrawn.

**As to claim 7-9**

See “as to claim 2 “above, as to claim 8. Hayashida et al. disclose a calculation process of a possible display range using a straight line distance of a horizontal and perpendicular direction of a screen map which it is possible to show on the screen (See Hayashida et al. FIG. 13; col.19, lines 38-67; col. 20, lines 1-59), but don’t disclose the processor which omits the nodes whose distance to next nodes are equal to or less than, a predetermined value.

The explicit claim limitations of claims 7-9 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayshida et al., are: **wherein the processor unit reduces a number of nodes consisting of the line figure of the route and the map area generator unit sets an area based on a simplified line figure (or omits the nodes whose distance to next nodes are equal or less than the predetermined value)**. The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant’s limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to these claims should be withdrawn.

**As to claim 10, 11**

The feature of Hayashida et al. is to select a road as the optimal route with the total searching cost (See Hayashida et al. FIG.22; col. 26, lines 62-64 etc.). Therefore, Hayashida et al. don’t disclose the map search unit which subdivides area into multiple area units and determines map data that intersects or is included in the areas by subdivided area unit (See our invention FIG. 10A, 10B; page. 12-13; page.14, lines 1-18).



The explicit claim limitations of claims 10-11 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **wherein the map search unit subdivides said area into multiple area units, and determines map data that intersects or is included in the areas by subdivided area unit.** The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to these claims should be withdrawn.

**As to claim 12, 13**

See "as to claim 1".

The explicit claim limitations of claims 12, 13 which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Hayashida et al., are: **with the map data based on rectangular coordinates, wherein the area generator unit establishes the area by adding corrections to correct a width of the area based on latitude values of the route.**

The Examiner should explicitly indicate (e.g., via page/column/line/reference numbers) those specific portions of Hayashida et al. disclosing arrangements which meet Applicant's limitations, or the 102 anticipatory-type rejection with respect to these claims should be withdrawn.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 rejection, and express written allowance of all of the '102 rejected claims, are respectfully requested. **Further,** at this point, it is respectfully submitted as a reminder that, **if new art is now**

cited against any of Applicant's unamended claims, then it would not be proper to make a next action final.

### **EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE**

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 501.43771X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Paul J. Skwierawski  
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk  
(703) 312-6600

Attachments :  
FIGS. 4A/4B replacement drawing sheet